



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of : Confirmation No. 5048  
Mitsuaki OSHIMA et al. : Docket No. 2004\_0198  
Serial No. 10/772,352 : Group Art Unit 2115  
Filed February 6, 2004 : Examiner D. Butler  
DATA PROCESSING APPARATUS : Mail Box: AF

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE UNDER 37. CFR 1.116  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
EXAMINING GROUP 2115**

Sir:

This paper is in response to the Final Office Action mailed March 28, 2005.

Claims 29-31 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,804,791.

A Terminal Disclaimer is filed concurrently herewith as a simple expedient to obviate the double patenting rejection. Accordingly, it is submitted that the double patenting rejection has been overcome.

The Terminal Disclaimer is intended simply to serve the statutory function of removing the double patenting rejection and is not meant to raise a presumption or estoppel on the merits of the double patenting rejection asserted by the Examiner.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 29-31 as being obvious over claims 1 and 8 of U.S. Patent 6,804,791 for the following reasons.

The Examiner asserts that "the external processor and block of claims 30 and 31 correspond to the functions performed by the first processing section in claim 1 of the patent." The Examiner also correctly points out that claims 29-31 broadly recite the invention directed mainly to the CPU/processor (as opposed to the first and second processing sections recited in the patent). In the

Enter

DMB

4-19-05